

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel
Meeting Summary

January 13-14, 2009
Allmendinger Center, Puyallup

Science Panel Members Present:

- Joel Baker
- Guy Gelfenbaum
- Robert Johnston
- Jan Newton
- Timothy Quinn
- Frank Shipley
- John Stark
- Katharine Wellman

*It is intended that this summary be used along with notebook materials provided for the meeting.
A recording of this meeting is retained by the Partnership as the formal record.*

Meeting Summary:

- Panel Basics
 - Strategic Science Plan
 - Puget Sound Partnership Science Update
 - Partnership Science Activities
 - Budget Update
 - State of Sound Report Update
 - Staffing Needs and Structure Discussion
 - Targets/Benchmarks for Some Environmental Indicators and for Performance Measures
 - 2009 Science Panel Work Plan
 - Work Session on Strategic Science Plan
-

CALL REGULAR MEETING TO ORDER

Science Panel Chair Joel Baker called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

PANEL BASICS

Joel reviewed the agenda and provided an update on upcoming activities. Joel reported that he recently met with David Dicks to discuss how the Science Panel fits in with the new implementation portion of the Action Agenda. By the end of today Joel would like to have a more specific view from the Science Panel on how they would like to proceed and the Science Panel's role in implementing the Action Agenda.

The Panel will start the discussion on how to move forward with science activities that will help with the next Action Agenda, discuss information needed, what implementation looks like, how to get there as a science panel, and start prioritizing what the Panel's focus should be during the Partnership Science Activities agenda item.

STRATEGIC SCIENCE PLAN (See meeting notebook for details.)

Jan Newton reviewed the revised Strategic Science Plan outline (January 9, 2009, version) and confirmed assignments.

The Panel discussed what is needed in the Strategic Science Plan, how the document will be used, and how the science community can plug into the process. The Panel believes their role is to provide processes and identify the desired outcome for the science community. The Panel also discussed the advantage of having the Partnership coordinate and organize the efforts around the Sound. The Panel agreed a write up on the role of the Partnership in Puget Sound science needs to be included in the introduction.

The Panel discussed how the Strategic Science Plan and State of the Sound reports will have overlapping information, as does the Biennial Science Work Plan (BSWP). The Panel may want to clarify how all these documents fit together. The Strategy is a 10-year document with the biennial planning details in the BSWP. The Panel needs to discuss tomorrow if there are any other pieces needed for Action Agenda implementation. The Panel has not reached agreement on its vision and goals and this needs to be done.

PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP SCIENCE UPDATE (See meeting notebook for details.)

Mary Ruckelshaus provided this report. She reviewed her handout on the Puget Sound Update noting that the Leadership Council will direct the outline of this document. The Science Panel is the first group to see this outline before it goes forward to the Council members for their direction.

Mary noted that the Puget Sound Science Update is meant to be the 'go to', 'one stop shopping', state-of-the-science document for the science supporting the work of the Puget Sound Partnership. This document will be the "bible" of information known about the Puget Sound and the base information for the next Action Agenda and BSWP. She discussed the need for standards and process to evaluate the information the authors include in the report. She is proposing the use of a modified Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) process. There will be a lead author but also teams where contributors will be noted.

The Panel discussed how a 4-year cycle for this update might be better since a 2-year cycle seems too short to invest so much into.

Mary reviewed the proposed timeline for completion of this report.

John Stark, Guy Gelfenbaum, Tim Quinn, and Jan Newton volunteered to work with Mary on this project.

PARTNERSHIP SCIENCE ACTIVITIES

Joel welcomed David Dicks to the Science Panel meeting.

David provided an update on agency activities noting that for him - 2009 equals clarity. He reported that the Action Agenda is completed and people are generally happy with the document – it is ambitious. He thanked the Panel for all their work on the Action Agenda. The next step is to figure out how everything fits together and begin implementation.

David asked the Panel members to provide thoughts on what is needed from the Partnership for success.

The Panel provided thoughts on needs including:

- Refine questions one and two in the Action Agenda – the more we can clarify questions one and two and links to the proposed actions the better off we'll be.
- Dialog back and forth with science and policy – the Panel would like to have more interaction with the senior management team. David noted he is going to try to come to as many of the regular Science Panel meetings as possible and the management team will talk internally about having another staff person or two attending these meetings.
- Have the Science Panel, Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB), and Leadership Council engage more to make sure we get the questions right with the science-policy link.
- Have topical workshops or briefings where the different groups are pulled together for feedback and direction.
- Take action and then do the adaptive management. This is where the communication really fits in.

David believes the cross-work team makes a lot of sense. He talked about the idea of having the Leadership Council members taking the lead on topical issues. He would also want to include people from the ECB and Science Panel in this follow up.

The Panel discussed that one thing the Partnership can do is make science work better for the whole system. We still need to have the discussion on how the science and

policy works together. There needs to be a marriage of scientific basis and political policy to be successful.

Scott Redman explained that he and Bob Johnston looked at the list of Action Agenda and Biennial Science Work Plan actions and coded those where there is a science policy interface.

David likes the idea of coming together around specific issues – things that are linked and additive. He noted that the Partnership can't do everything but could convene and link the science and policy sides of the issues. To do the work the Partnership will need additional intellectual horsepower on staff. The Partnership won't have 50 staff but will add 7-8 or 9 who will be able to link the processes.

David stressed the need to spend upfront time to figure out what needs to be done, and not get caught up in the momentum, to be successful.

BUDGET (See meeting notebook for details.)

David set this agenda item up by reviewing the state's budget process. Jim Cahill reviewed the meeting handouts. Jim noted that overall the Partnership is happy with the governor's budget since we fared pretty well compared to other agencies and programs. The Partnership will need to work throughout the session to keep at this budget level.

David and Jim had to leave the meeting so the Panel was unable to get very far into this agenda item.

STATE OF THE SOUND (See meeting notebook for details.)

Martha Neuman and Mary Beth Brown presented this agenda item.

Martha reviewed the handout outlining the State of the Sound's two-part process explaining that several issues that weren't completed in the Action Agenda would be completed in the State of the Sound. Timeline for this work has now until June to work on the performance management framework, July to October work on the report. We are still missing the analysis piece.

Mary Beth discussed the performance management framework and explained the way other places have implemented performance management. She explained that a lot of places have indicators and report cards. There is a trend where starting to apply data toward management decisions – one of the first such systems was citystat, which then came to Washington as GMAP and to Chesapeake Bay as BayMap.

Chesapeake is now having to link budget, actions, and outcomes – we are at the point where we need to do the hard work to develop our process.

The Panel discussed the need to provide information that the general public and legislators understand.

Mary Beth has asked the state natural resource agencies that reported through GMAP to cross walk that data with the Action Agenda and use the 2007-09 information for reporting.

The Panel discussed concerns with changing the format of the State of the Sound report too much from past reports. Mary Beth believes Part 2 A would be similar to the last State of the Sound report. Scott would say all of Part 2 is the same the difference would be in the organization around goals and the Action Agenda.

The Panel provided comments on the document development and layout. One suggestion was to provide updates on the indicators from previous reports. The group discussed the indicators and need for small set of reporting indicators.

Joel would still encourage the Partnership to revise the 2007-09 State of the Sound report and create a companion document with the performance management issue this year. Martha noted this is a transitional year, part 1 is a one-time document where part 2 is the truer State of the Sound report. She could provide this information in two different documents.

Martha summarized what she heard from the Panel: In general the Panel supports both pieces needing to be done, believe there should be two documents and two processes. She and Mary Beth will go back and revise the outlines for documents and revise the schedule. This issue will come back before the Panel at its meetings through March 2010.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public testimony.

STAFFING NEEDS AND STRUCTURE DISCUSSION

Due to weather concerns, the discussion on staffing needs and structure discussion was cut short at the December Science Panel meeting. Scott Redman provided the spreadsheet from the December 17 discussion and the Panel reoriented themselves from that discussion.

The Panel discussed the preferred structure and staffing needs, then talked about different ways for the work to get done and the science linkages. They discussed

differences between on-going working groups and short-term teams. They discussed ideas for ECB, Leadership Council, and Science Panel member work groups to develop the questions that need to be asked. They discussed which issues need work groups associated with them and how many groups are needed.

The Panel will continue the staffing and budget discussions on day two of the meeting.

5:00 p.m. RECESS FOR THE EVENING

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel
Meeting Summary

January 13-14, 2009

Science Panel Members Present:

- Joel Baker
- Guy Gelfenbaum
- Robert Johnston
- Jan Newton
- Timothy Quinn
- Frank Shipley
- John Stark

RECONVENED MEETING – Joel Baker, Chair

Science Panel Chair Joel Baker reconvened the meeting at 8:30 a.m., reviewed the agenda for the day, and provided an overview of the first day of the meeting.

BUDGET DISCUSSION CONTINUED

Joel Baker reported that he believes the Science Panel should provide to David Dicks and Jim Cahill a Science Panel prioritized list for the \$10 million in federal funds. This is his goal for today's meeting.

The Panel then discussed how to do this budgeting exercise and need to fund projects that are critical for success. The Panel discussed what level of involvement they should have in the list of budget items. Joel reported the need to make sure the proposal builds the capacity and programs that will move the science forward.

The Panel decided that they need to stake claim on the science needs and decide what funding is critical for the Science Panel such as funding for staffing and seed money to start projects. Scott explained how the Panel began the work to revise the Panel's original \$26 million list of projects to a \$10 million request during the December Science Panel meeting but did not complete it at that meeting. Jim Cahill has now requested the Panel get the list of priorities to \$3 million. The Panel will continue discussion during the afternoon session to provide a list of priority projects to provide to David Dicks and Jim Cahill.

TARGETS/BENCHMARKS FOR SOME ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS AND FOR PERFORMANCE MEASURES (See meeting notebook materials for details.)

Scott Redman and Mary Beth Brown presented this agenda item.

Joel Baker noted the need for the Panel to complete work on the indicators, provide guidance needed for development of the phase 2 indicators, and enhance communication with Leadership Council and Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) on how the indicators should be used or not used soon.

The Panel discussed the ways to use the indicators, targets, and benchmarks, need for stretch goals and realistic timelines. There are both science and policy decisions in this issue. Benchmarks and targets are really a negotiation process that needs to be facilitated. Joel is not sure the Panel is ready to have this discussion with ECB and Leadership Council before having its own discussion on what 2020 needs to look like. The Panel then discussed the futures trends and modeling the alternatives to compare a future state to a target. Joel asked if there is a way of modeling out the “as is” future? There is a way and some groups are doing this. The Panel agreed this isn’t a linear process but will be ongoing.

Joel noted the need for the Panel to have a discussion with the Leadership Council on how they want to use the indicators, then get the larger group together to make sure everyone is on the same page, and then identify smaller work groups to clarify the indicators, targets, and benchmarks.

There is currently an indicator work group consisting of Frank Shipley, Joel Baker, Trina Wellman, Tim Quinn, Martha Kongsgaard, Bill Wilkerson, and Steve Sakuma. The Panel suggested adding Sandie O’Neill, Phil Levin, Mark Plummer, and ECB representatives to this group.

Ken Currens reminded the Panel that there are already benchmarks set in many areas and this is the only group that looks across the ecosystem.

Scott will work on a catalog of existing benchmarks for the next meeting.

Mary Beth reported that the Partnership has Louis Sweeney on contract to look at the proposed indicators and track down data. He is supposed to have this information ready by February. He will need to have the larger group discussion before he can complete his assignment.

The Science Panel needs additional discussion on phase 2 indicator needs and next steps for final indicator selection.

BUDGET continued

Joel explained the exercise for this meeting is to create a high-level spreadsheet with Science Panel budget priorities to provide to David Dicks and Jim Cahill.

Jan Newton and Scott Redman led this discussion explaining the spreadsheet. The Panel stepped through the table highlighting priorities to get to a \$6 million request.

The final list consisted priorities under Action Agenda:

1. Priority D: Puget Sound Assessment (Big IEA)
2. Priority E: Report development - State of the Sound and Puget Sound Science Update
3. Priority B: Enhanced restoration investigation (e.g., Elwha, Nisqually, etc.)
4. Reducing uncertainties around management strategies (e.g., toxic loading, food web, nearshore restoration, ecosystem services)
5. Priority E: Monitoring coordination
6. Priority C: Pollution reduction science

The total request of \$6,030,000 will be provided to David and Jim.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public testimony

WORKSESSION ON STRATEGIC SCIENCE PLAN

2009 SCIENCE PANEL WORK PLAN (See meeting notebook for details.)

Joel noted the Work Plan calendar in the meeting packet is a way for Tammy to organize meetings throughout the year. The Panel won't work on this today but it is included in the packet as an informational piece for the Panel. Tammy's goal is to develop a similar document for Leadership Council and ECB's 2009 meeting planning.

ADJOURN REGULAR MEETING SESSION

Adjourned at 1:28 p.m.

WORKSESSION ON STRATEGIC SCIENCE PLAN

Joel noted that the afternoon session is schedule is set aside for work on the Strategic Science Plan before breaking into smaller working groups to focus on the different sections.

The February meeting will be a work session dedicated to working on the Strategic Science Plan. Panel members were asked to get changes to Scott by February 19 so he can have the revised version for the work session on February 26.

The Panel continued to work on revisions to the Strategic Science Plan document working off the January 9, 2009, draft outline version.

Ken Currens noted the five pieces needed for a strategic science plan:

- Get the people right
- Get the right people
- Get the science right
- Get the right science
- Communicate the results

The Panel discussed releasing this document for a “peer review” to get other perspectives before finalizing the document. The question was asked if this document will be the Science Panel’s Strategic Science Plan or the Puget Sound Partnerships’ Strategic Science Plan. This is the Science Panel’s plan but will be used in the Puget Sound Partnership’s overall science program.

3:00 p.m. ADJOURN

Respectfully submitted by:
Tammy Owings
Special Assistant to the Boards

Next Meeting: February 26, 2009 Work Session